

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5 and 8-19 are pending in the present application, claims 4, 6 and 7 having been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer as to the subject matter contained therein, new claims 15-19 having been added by this amendment. Reconsideration in view of the following remarks is kindly requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant acknowledges the Examiner's indication that claims 8-14 contain allowable subject matter, and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. By this Amendment, Applicant has rewritten claim 8 into independent form including all the claim limitations of claims 1 and 2. Therefore, claims 8-14 are at least allowable as they depend from an allowable independent claim 8.

Comment on Reasons for Allowance

The Examiner has indicated that claim 8 is allowable, as the prior art allegedly does not teach or suggest a structure comprising, at least: a second leads group disposed opposite the first leads group, and the plurality of bonding wires having a first plurality of bonding wires and a second plurality of bonding wires electrically connecting the first leads group and the second leads group; respectively, with the plurality of bonding pads", as recited in claim 8. While Applicant submits that claim 8 is allowable for at least this reason, Applicant further submits that the reasons set forth for the allowability of claim 8 should not be imputed into any of the other claims herein. Claims 1 and 15 (and those claims dependent thereon) are allowable for reasons other than relied on by the Examiner for claim 8.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Tanaka et al. (USP 6,121,681). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Initially with respect to claims 6 and 7, these claims have been cancelled, thus, the rejection as to claims 6 and 7 is now moot. With regard to independent claim 1, Applicant submits that Tanaka et al. fail to teach or suggest a semiconductor integrated circuit, comprising, at least: a plurality of leads formed on the side of the semiconductor chip opposite the side on which the bonding pads are disposed for connection to the bonding pads, in combination with the other features and/or structural correlation recited in independent claim 1.

Referring to FIGS. 1, 15 and 17 of Tanaka et al., Tanaka discloses a semiconductor device 1 having external terminals BP (bonding pads) thereon. As shown in FIG. 1, the external terminals BP are provided on one side of chip 1 and electrically connected to a plurality of inner leads 2A via bonding wires 6. On the other side opposed to the one side of the chip 1, there is provided another plurality of inner leads 2B to be extending along the other side. Leads 2B are not individually connected electrically to the external terminals BP (bonding pads) of the semiconductor chip 1. Therefore, the inner leads 2B are not for connection with the bonding pads, as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, Tanaka et al. makes it explicitly clear that leads 2B are not for connection to the external terminals BP, see col. 4, lines 61-64 of Tanaka et al. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 1 is allowable at least for the reason that Tanaka et al. fail to teach each and every feature of the claim 1, as required by 35 U.S.C. §102. Withdrawal of the rejection as to claim 1 is earnestly solicited. Additionally, claim 2 is allowable at least for the reason that claim 2 depends off allowable independent claim 1.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka et al. as applied to claim 2, in view of Torres et al. (USP 5,962,926). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Initially, claim 4 has been cancelled, thus the rejection as to claim 4 is now moot. Applicant submits that claims 3 and 5 are allowable at least for the reasons set forth above regarding independent claim 1. Torres et al. neither teaches nor suggests a plurality of leads formed on the side of the semiconductor chip opposite the side on which the bonding pads are disposed for connection with the bonding pads. Thus, Tanaka et al. and Torres et al., either singly or in combination, fail to teach each and every feature of the independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 3 and 5 are allowable for at least this reason.

New Claims

New claims 15-19 have been added in an effort to provide further protection for Applicant's invention. Applicant submits that claims 15-19 are allowable for at least the features recited therein.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each of claims 1-3, 5 and 8-19 in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Matthew J. Lattig (Reg. No. 45,274) at (703) 668-8026 (direct).

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By 

John A. Castellano, Reg. No. 35,094

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

JAC/MJL:js